

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Attached hereto are replacement figure sheets for Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4, which include the changes, without markings, identified below.

Figures 1-4 have been amended to include the screen 13 onto which the light emitted from the emitter layer 4 is projected in order to form an image.

All of the figures on the replacement sheet, as originally filed, are provided herein. The header of the revised drawing sheet includes the following information: (i) "Replacement Sheet", (ii) Title of Invention, (iii) Inventor(s) Name, and (iv) Application Serial Number. The Examiner is requested to provide an indication of such consideration in the next Office Action.

### **REMARKS**

The Non-Final Office Action of November 15, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully analyzed. Claims 20-24, non-elected claims with traverse in the reply filed October 12, 2004, were cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer in Applicant's Reply to the Quayle Office Action, filed on August 22, 2005, in response to the Examiner's Quayle Office Action, indicating claims 1-19 were allowed. Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application, of which claim 1 is an independent claim.

By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 8 and 10 have been amended to overcome rejections in the outstanding Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

#### ***Drawing Objection***

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, more particularly, failing to show the screen cited in claim 14.

Figures 1-4 have been amended to include a screen, as shown in the attached drawing sheets.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the drawing objection.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph***

Claims 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With regard to claim 8, the Examiner alleges that claim 8 improperly uses the term, "comprising" in the Markush groups. Accordingly, claim 8 has been amended to clarify the claim limitation for the light-emitting polymer, removing use of the term, "comprising". With regard to claim 10, the Examiner alleges that the term, "high" is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. Accordingly, claim 10 has been amended to clarify the claim limitation for the excitation light source, removing the use of the term, "high". These amendments are made for the sole purpose of clarifying claims 8 and 10. These amendments are not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore, Applicant does not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8 and 10, as amended, fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 8 and 10.

### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,117,529 issued to Leising, *et al.* ("Leising"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 to be proper, a single reference must disclose each and every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel features that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection improper.

Claim 1, as presently amended, recites:

"A display using a photoluminescence quenching device, comprising...an electrical field formed between the first electrode and the second electrode which controllably quenches the photoluminescence light from the emitter layer."

Leising fails to teach each and every claim limitations as presently recited in amended claim 1, more particularly, Leising fails to teach an electrical field formed between the first and second electrode which controllably quenches the photoluminescence light from the emitter layer. Rather, Leising discloses additional charge transport layers 12 and 13 arranged between the active layer 3 and electrodes 2 and 6 to isolate the excited states from the electrodes 2 and 6, thereby reducing the quenching of the luminescence at defect centers mainly located near the electrodes 2 and 6 (See col. 11, lines 54-61), i.e. the transport layers 12 and 13 are formed and arranged to controllably reduce the quenching of the photoluminescence light from the emitter layer. Claims 2-19 depend from independent claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-19. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and claims 2-19 that depend therefrom are allowable.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: February 13, 2006

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027**

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Telephone No. (703) 288-5105  
Facsimile No. (703) 288-5139  
HCP:BYC:kbs